

## 7 Overt gender marking depending on syntactic context in Ripano

Tania Paciaroni and Michele Loporcaro

### 7.1 Introduction

The Italo-Romance variety spoken in Ripatransone marks gender both overtly on the noun and also on associated parts of speech, but this double expression is not found across the board. Rather, overt gender marking, as exemplified in (1), is conditioned in a way that—to the best of our knowledge—has never been described:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> We depart from the Leipzig glossing rules in using non- instead of N- for ‘non’ in nonF ‘non-feminine’, so as to avoid confusion with N(EUTER). Since we never provide examples in moods other than the indicative, the gloss PRS is shorthand for ‘present indicative’. As will become apparent when we introduce inflectional paradigms for nouns and adjectives (in (36)/(38) and (5)–(6), respectively), the *-a* ending occurs in the weak paradigm of the relevant ICs in all cells but the feminine singular. On the other hand, *-a* can be associated with the values ‘feminine’ and ‘singular’ in agreement targets which belong to closed non-lexical parts of speech classes as well as in place names such as *'ro:ma* ‘Rome(F)’ (cf. n. 22). Thus, in view of the paradigm illustrated below in (38), the ending in *'t:jemb-a/-ə* can be glossed as nonF.SG: this gloss is morphological, in the sense of Baerman, Brown, and Corbett (2005: 11f.), rather than syntactic, since morphosyntactic information in (1) says that the whole NP is M.SG. However, since the *-u* ending in *'t:jemb-u* signals M.SG unambiguously (from a paradigmatic point of view), we thought it good to differentiate the two glosses so that the difference stands out, even if this includes some eclecticism in glossing (cf. the next footnote). In fact, had we glossed syntactically throughout, both *'t:jemb-a* and *'t:jemb-u* would have been specified as - M.SG, which would have entailed loss of information relevant for our present concern.

- (1) *kə*            *'tjemb-u/\*-a*                      *'b:rut:-u*  
 what      time(M)-M.SG/-nonF.SG      bad-M.SG  
 ‘what a bad time/weather!’

In (1) the noun *'tjembu* is preceded by the complementizer *kə* (which is invariable) and controls agreement in gender and number (masculine singular *-u*) on the adjective *'b:rut:u*. The same morphosyntactic feature values on the noun are realized by the same suffix *-u* (hence the gender-specification in the gloss for the ending) as on the agreeing adjective, while in phrases containing a determiner, the noun takes a different form:<sup>2</sup>

- (2) a. *l-u*            *'b:rut:-ə/\*-u*                      *'tjemb-a/\*-u*  
 DEF-M.SG      bad-nonF.SG/-M.SG              time(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
 ‘the bad weather’
- b. *l-u*            *'tjemb-a/-ə/\*-u*                      *'kəp:-u*  
 DEF-M.SG      time(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG              change.PRS-[3]M.SG  
 ‘the weather changes’

---

<sup>2</sup> The gloss of the verb form *'kəp:u* in (2b) is based on syntactic information rather than being strictly morphological (cf. n. 1). In isolation, this form can be either first or second or third person, given that in Ripano person marking in the singular is entirely neutralized (see (16)). In the examples, instances of the alternative pronunciations *-a/-ə* as in (2b) *'tjemb-a/-ə* (cf. 7.2 for more details) are glossed only once as *-nonF.SG*.

In (2a-b) the same lexical item ‘time’, with the same feature specification (masculine singular), is preceded by the definite article *lu* (as well as an adjective, in (2a)) and has a different form than in (1), with a final *-a/-ə* instead of *-u*, while the article and the verb agree with their controller and realize the gender/number marking through the masculine singular suffix *-u*. No noun, in Ripano, ends in *-u* in the singular, unless it is masculine. We thus face a *prima facie* case of overt gender, as defined by Corbett (1991: 62):

Languages in which the gender of a noun is evident from its form are often described as having ‘overt’ gender; those where gender is not shown by the form of the noun have ‘covert’ gender.

If gender marking worked like (1) throughout, Ripano would fit squarely the definition of a canonical gender system, where it is expected that gender is marked on the noun itself and is expressed on agreeing parts of speech (Corbett 2006a: 11). On the other hand, the alternation (1)/(2) provides interesting insights into non-canonicity in grammatical gender, as overt gender marking on the noun is subject to conditions. In what follows, we illustrate the factors which bear on the realization of overt gender marking. These include: i) the phonological form of the controller; ii) its gender value and iii) its inflectional class (IC); iv) the presence of agreement targets; v) the parts of speech serving as targets; vi) the shape of the target (in one given context), and vii) the relative order of target and controller.

We first introduce Ripano, the data sources, and the word-final vowel system (7.2), then move on to describe its gender system (7.3). We then analyse the prerequisites for overt gender marking (7.4), and survey the syntactic conditions which drive the choice between the two sets of paradigms already exemplified in (1)–(2) (7.5). Then we concentrate on the shape conditions on noun and determiners and their impact on the realization of overt gender (7.6). In 7.7 we offer some concluding remarks.

## 7.2 Ripano

Ripatransone is a small town of about 4300 inhabitants in the southern Marche province of Ascoli Piceno (see Figure 1), whose interesting dialect has already been the object of previous studies: e.g. Mengel (1936), Egidi (1965), Parrino (1967), Lüdtkke (1976), Harder (1988), Mancini (1993), Ferrari-Bridgers (2010), D’Alessandro (2012, 2017), Ledgeway (2012: 299–310), D’Alessandro and Pescarini (2016), and Burroni *et al.* (2016).

Insert Fig 1 about here.

Data on Ripano are available from several sources, first and foremost the extensive description by Harder (1988). In addition, we analysed a corpus of written productions by native speakers: a dictionary (Rossi 2008), grammar notes (Rossi 2008: 15–47; Cardarelli 2010: 91–117), and folk literature (Rossi 1999, Lambertelli 2003, Cardarelli 2010: 17–90, 119–237). Finally, we have collected examples and grammaticality judgements during several field trips to Ripatransone. The examples discussed in this paper come mainly from fieldwork, but have been checked against the other sources.

As for the inventory of features and their values, Ripano provides a picture fairly typical for Central-Southern Italo-Romance varieties, with two number values and (under Loporcaro and Paciaroni’s 2011 analysis) four gender values. However, as for the inflectional realization of these morphosyntactic features, the Ripano system is quite exotic, since almost every part of speech can be an agreement target (7.3). Moreover, the distribution of the features across parts of speech is quite spectacular for a Romance variety.

This peculiar inflectional system has arisen as all non-low final unstressed vowels (still contrasting inflections in the dialects to the north and west) merged into *-ə/*, as it happened in the varieties spoken immediately to the south, from Ascoli Piceno down to

Apulia and Northern Calabria. At this stage (see Parrino 1967: 156–9; Lüdtke 1976: 82; Harder 1988: 35–42, 100–1; Loporcaro and Vigolo 2002–3: 9–10), Ripano must have been like nearby Ascolano, which contrasts final unstressed *-a/* with *-ə/* (< /-i, -e, -o, -u/; cf. Gaspari 1971–2: 158f.; *AIS* pt. 578), while most Central-Southern dialects further merged *-a/* into *-ə/*. In a second step, final *-a/* raised to *-e/*—which then remained stable—while *-ə/* acquired an allophone *-[a]* (which has nothing to do with etymological Proto-Romance *-A* > *-e/*). Finally, this *-ə/* (→ *-[ə]* or *-[a]*) remained as a default ending, in terms of both morphology and syntax, as illustrated below, but was recoloured as *-u/* or *-i/* when occurring in certain inflections, subject to rather intricate conditions to be described in what follows (and, for *-u/*, already hinted in (1)–(2)). In the meantime also *-e/* extended to further inflections than those where it was justified etymologically, so as to mark, like the other endings, morphosyntactic feature values also in rather unexpected contexts.

More recently, the system then became even more complex as new instances of final unstressed *-a/* were (re)introduced, which occur in the feminine singular of determiners, quantifiers and place names (not in nouns and adjectives), and thereby started to compete with inherited *-e/* (< Proto-Romance *-A*). Since this latter *-[a]* cannot be realized as *-[ə]*, what we have today is a phonemic contrast with asymmetric neutralization: *-a/*, never realized as *-[ə]*, contrasting with *-ə/*, realized as *-[a]* or *-[ə]*. (Thus, in case we provide citation forms transcribed as e.g. *ˈn:ɛnda/-ə* ‘nothing’, we imply that the phoneme is *-ə/*, not *-a/*.) The complexity in the agreement system as well as the considerable variation across speakers and contexts make the system unstable, as illustrated in both the academic and the folk literature

on Ripano (cf. the sociolinguistic overview by Ferrari-Bridgers 2010). This instability is partly responsible for the non-homogeneous picture of the status of  $[-\text{ə}]$  and  $[-\text{a}]$  provided by the literature. Our informants vacillate in nominal/pronominal inflection between  $[-\text{ə}]$  and  $[-\text{a}]$  as the suffix for feminine plural and for neuter as well as for the default form of the reduced paradigm (see Section 7.3 below):  $[-\text{a}]$  is preferred in prepausal position,  $[-\text{ə}]$  utterance-internally (cf. n. 10), while our sole informant for rural Ripano tends to generalise  $[-\text{ə}]$  also prepausally. For further data and discussion, see Harder (1988: 134–6, 235–41); Mancini (1993); Ferrari-Bridgers (2010: 116–8), for other analyses, focused on the verbal agreement system, see Lüdtke (1976: 82) and recently Ledgeway (2012: 302–5).

### 7.3 Grammatical gender in Ripano

Following Corbett (1991: 147–50; 2012: 80–5), who, elaborating on Hockett (1958: 231) and Zaliznjak (1964), defines genders as agreement classes distinguished by sets of agreement forms, we set up four (controller) gender values: masculine (M), feminine (F), mass neuter (N), and non-autonomous neuter (NAN). The Ripano gender system is schematized in (3), where gender agreement is exemplified with definite articles:

(3)	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
N	<i>l-ə</i>	<i>'pa</i>		Ø
	DEF-N.SG	bread(N)		
M	<i>l-u</i>	<i>'ka</i>	<i>l-i</i>	<i>'ka</i>
	DEF-M.SG	dog(M)	DEF-M.PL	dog(M)
NAN	<i>l-u</i>	<i>'vrat:fa</i>	<i>l-ə</i>	<i>'vrat:fa</i>
	DEF-M.SG	arm(NAN)	DEF-F.PL	arm(NAN)
F	<i>l-e/l-a</i>	<i>'ma</i>	<i>l-ə</i>	<i>'ma</i>
	DEF-F.SG	hand(F)	DEF-F.PL	hand(F)
		'the bread/dog/arm/hand'		'the dogs/arms/hands'

The article displays a three-way inflectional contrast in the singular (*lə 'pa* 'the bread' vs *lu 'ka/vrat:fa* 'the dog/arm' vs *le/la 'ma* 'the hand'), but just a two-way distinction in the plural (*li 'ka* 'the dogs' vs *lə 'vrat:fa/ma* 'the arms/hands'). In fact, neuter nouns like *'pa* 'bread', being all [-COUNT], lack a plural form, whereas nouns like *'vrat:fa* 'arm' trigger a fully syncretic agreement pattern, selecting the same article form as the masculine *'ka* 'dog' in the singular and as the feminine *'ma* 'hand' in the plural. This agreement class is identical to the Romanian neuter, which is also a 'non-autonomous' gender value (Corbett 2011: 459f.).<sup>3</sup> Assuming Corbett's (1991: 151) distinction of 'controller genders, the genders into which nouns are divided, from target genders, the genders which are marked on adjectives,

<sup>3</sup> Additional detail on both mass and non-autonomous neuter gender, and a discussion of alternative analysis can be found in Loporcaro and Paciaroni (2011) and Paciaroni *et al.* (2013). For further discussion and references on Romanian gender see Corbett (1991: 150–4), and more recently Loporcaro (2016)—upholding the same three-gender analysis of Romanian as Corbett—vs Maiden (2015), who advocates a two-gender analysis.

verbs and so on’, we set up four controller genders and three target genders: masculine, feminine, and mass neuter.

We examine now the array and the inflection of agreement targets. The presentation proceeds gradually from the more to the less canonical ones—for the range and the crosslinguistic frequency of agreement targets see Corbett (1991: 106–15; 2006: 40–53).

Table (4) illustrates the paradigm of the definite articles—cf. Harder (1988: 117–8). The two forms in each cell are selected before initial consonants and vowels, respectively:

(4) Definite article

GENDER	NUMBER	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL
N	lə; l	—
M	lu; l	li; j:
F	le/la; l	lə <sup>4</sup> ; l

As for the marking of gender/number, the feminine singular cell shows overabundance (see Thornton 2011), with two forms, *le/la*, in free variation, a pattern found in all agreement targets which belong to closed part of speech classes.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Whereas Ferrari-Bridgers (2010: 115f.) claims that “according to Rossi (2008: 19), in the most conservative variety of Ripano, the plural feminine form is always [a]” in both nouns and determiners, we have not found any instance of F.PL *la* in in the folk literature or in our recordings with Alfredo Rossi and other speakers. Cf. Rossi (2009: 19): “l’articolo determinativo plurale va pronunciato come nella lingua francese” [translation T.P. and M.L.: “the plural definite article has to be pronounced as in French”].



The article varies not only (morphosyntactically) according to gender and number, but also (allomorphically) according to the shape of its controller. It ends in a vowel when followed by a consonant, but in a consonant, as the final vowel is dropped, when followed by a vowel. Only the prevocalic allomorph *j:* of the masculine plural departs from the form occurring elsewhere (*l*), because of a sound change which affected *\*li* prevocalically (> *\*ɹ:* > *j:*). Other determiners besides the article make the same distinctions;<sup>6</sup> cf. Harder (1988: 118–9) on the indefinite article—which lacks plural forms –, and 147–52 on the demonstratives (*'kwɪ*)*ftu*/*'kwɪ*)*ssu*/*'kwɪ*)*llu* ‘this (near speaker)/this (near hearer)/that’.

Another crosslinguistically common type of gender/number agreement target is the adjective. There is just one affixal inflectional class (5i)—plus the uninflected one (5ii) containing adjectives ending in a stressed vowel except *-o*; cf. Harder (1988: 132–3). Within (5i) we can distinguish two subclasses depending on the absence or presence of stem alternation. In addition, adjectives also show two sets of inflections, with one set making more distinctions than the other.<sup>7</sup> Table (5) illustrates the full paradigm:

---

<sup>5</sup> Diachronically, this is due to recent standardization as the form *le* is being replaced by the innovative *la*, due to the contact with Standard Italian (cf. Mancini 1993: 131, n. 4; Cardarelli 2010: 15, who notice this on-going change only in the definite article, whereas we have consistently observed its spread into other closed parts of speech as well, also in Cardarelli’s written texts).

<sup>6</sup> ‘We can use the term “determiner” to denote the set of such words that occur in the same position in the noun phrase and do not co-occur with each other’ (Dryer 2007: 161).

<sup>7</sup> For the use of ‘strong’ vs ‘weak’, ‘full’ vs ‘reduced’ cf. Corbett (2006: 82f., n. 2, 93–6).

(5) Adjective. Strong paradigm (full agreement)

IC	ISC	GENDER	NUMBER		example	gloss	
			SINGULAR	PLURAL			
I	a.	N	A + <i>a</i>		'b:rut:a	—	'ugly'
		M	A + <i>u</i>	A + <i>i</i>	'b:rut:u	'b:ruti	
		F	A + <i>e</i>	A + <i>a</i>	'b:rut:e	'b:rut:a	
	b.	N	A + <i>a</i>		'b:el:a	—	'beautiful'
		M	B + <i>u</i>	C + <i>i</i>	'b:jel:u	'b:jeji	
		F	A + <i>e</i>	A + <i>a</i>	'b:el:e	'b:el:a	
II			uninfllected: - <i>ǂ</i>		'blu	—	'blue'
					'blu	'blu	
					'blu	'blu	

The first subclass (5i.a) consists of adjectives with a single stem for all gender/number values, which is symbolized in the schema by the five identical capital letters, showing gender/number agreement only via suffixal inflection. A second subclass contains adjectives with a stressed mid vowel in the root, which underwent metaphonic diphthongization before final high vowels, thus resulting in richer inflection.<sup>8</sup> The result is a multi-layered binary contrast; first, there is a masculine vs neuter/feminine stem form contrast, then within the masculine there is a further singular vs plural contrast—in (5i.b) distinct capitals symbolize stem alternation. This means that four of the five cells that are syntactically distinguished host

<sup>8</sup> As will be shown in (6), the diphthong arisen via metaphony resisted the reshaping of word-final unstressed vowels (cf. 7.2) in the weak paradigm, where *'b:je!a* and *'b:jej:a* show a diphthong despite their original *-u/-i* having been replaced by *-a*.

a distinct form, the forms for neuter and feminine singular being identical. In subclass (5i.a) there is simple affixal exponence, whereas in subclass (5i.b) there is double exponence.

Compare now the reduced paradigm:

(6) Adjective. Weak paradigm (reduced agreement)

IC	ISC	GENDER	NUMBER		example	gloss	
			SINGULAR	PLURAL			
I	a.	N	A + a		'b:rut:a	—	'ugly'
		M	A + a	A + a	'b:rut:a	'b:rut:a	
		F	A + e	A + a	'b:rut:e	'b:rut:a	
	b.	N	A + a		'b:ɛ:l:a	—	'beautiful'
		M	B + a	C + a	'b:je:l:a	'b:je:j:a	
		F	A + e	A + a	'b:ɛ:l:e	'b:ɛ:l:a	
II			uninflected: -V		'blu	—	'blue'
					'blu	'blu	
					'blu	'blu	

Here, all final vowels but *-e* (which expresses feminine singular) are replaced by *-a*, which results in fewer distinct forms than in the full paradigm—although the number of syntactically distinguished cells is the same. Within the first subclass (6i.a) there are only two distinct forms, one for the feminine singular and the other for the rest. Within the second subclass (6i.b) there still are four distinct forms, due to stem alternation in the masculine forms. The feminine singular form is the only one that is non-syncretic with any other cells in both sets of inflections.

Belonging to one or the other (sub)class is a lexical property, whereas the selection of the full or reduced paradigm depends on two outside factors: the presence vs absence of a determiner (or of another agreeing target preceding the noun) as well as the order of the modifier with respect to the noun. Example (7), where the determiner is absent, shows full agreement:

- (7)     'ju:tə = ma                      'b:jel:-u/\*-a/\*-ə                      frə'ki  
           help.IMP.2SG=1SG.IO       beautiful\M-M.SG/-nonF.SG       child(M)  
           ‘help me, beautiful child!’

Example (8), where the determiner is present, shows full agreement of the adjective in postnominal position—cf. also (1) above:<sup>9</sup>

- (8)     l-u                      'ka/'fij:-u                      'b:jel:-u/\*-a/\*-ə  
           DEF-M.SG       dog(M) /son(M)-M.SG    beautiful\M-M.SG/-nonF.SG  
           ‘the beautiful dog/son’

Adjectives display agreement according to the full paradigm (5) also in predicate position:

- (9)     ʃtu                      'fɛr:a       ,ɛ                      'b:wo:n-u/\*-a //                      'r:ut:-u/\*-a  
           DEM.M.SG    iron(M)   be.PRS.3    good\M-M.SG/-nonF.SG    broken\M-M.SG/-nonF.SG  
           ‘this iron is good/broken’

---

<sup>9</sup> Note in passing that the presence (*'fij:-u*) vs absence (*'ka*) of overt gender marking on the noun does not affect adjective inflection.

Example (10) shows that prenominal adjectives take the reduced form when preceded by a determiner:<sup>10</sup>

(10)	l-u/	n-u	'b:ʝel:-ə/*-u	'ka/'fij:-a
	DEF-M.SG	INDF-M.SG	beautiful\M-nonF.SG/-M.SG	dog(M)/son(M)-nonF.SG
	'the/a beautiful dog/son'			

This is somewhat reminiscent of strong vs weak adjective inflection in German, whose selection likewise depends on syntactic context (a point to be resumed in 7.5): e.g., (*ein*) *schön-er Junge* [(INDF[M.SG]) handsome-M.SG boy(M)] 'handsome boy' (full agreement) vs *der schön-e Junge* [DEF.M.SG handsome-M.SG boy(M)] 'the handsome boy' (reduced agreement).

A further type of agreement target is the participle, which inflects like class one adjectives, but never occurs prenominally (and so never takes reduced inflection), as exemplified in (11):<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> The restoration of final distinct vowels mentioned in 7.2 proves to be a still synchronically active rule, as *-ə/* is realized as *-[a]* clause-finally or before a pause, but may be realized as *-[ə]*, as well as *-[a]*, within the clause. Similar allophonic rules are found in several Central-Southern Italo-Romance varieties. For instance the same rule has been described by Loporcario and Silvestri (2011: 331) for the Northern Calabrian dialect of Verbicario (province of Cosenza).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also, from folk literature (Rossi 1999: 28, 158):

(i)	a.	l-u	tiemb-a	nn=è	passat-u
		DEF-M.SG	time(M)-nonF.SG	NEG=be.PRS.3	pass.PTP-M.SG
		'time has not passed by'			

- (11) a. l-u            'tjemb-ə            k            a            pa's:at-u  
 DEF-M.SG    time(M)-nonF.SG    which    have.PRS.3    pass.PTP-M.SG  
 'the time which has passed by'
- b. 'kak:            'uɔm:ən-a            ,ε            'rmaʃt-i  
 some            man(M)-nonF.SG    be.PRS.3    remain.PTP-M.PL  
 a            j:ə'ka            a            'kart-a  
 to            play.INF            to            card(F)-nonF.SG  
 'some men stayed playing cards'

Several types of pronoun occur as agreement targets. Personal pronouns—stressed and clitic—never occur in syntactic contexts requiring reduced agreement: so, as usual in Romance, their 3rd person forms agree categorically in gender and number (3SG 'is:u M vs 'es:e F vs 'es:a N, 3PL 'iʃ:i/'lo:ra M vs 'es:a/'lo:ra F) with their antecedent when used anaphorically—see also Harder (1988: 141–4).<sup>12</sup> The relative pronoun 'kə 'which' and the interrogative pronouns 'ki/'kə 'who/what' are uninflected—see Harder (1988: 160).

Cardinal numerals from 'one' to 'one thousand' have two sets of forms: a full paradigm that distinguishes a masculine form and a feminine form, and a reduced paradigm that makes no distinction (cf. Harder 1988: 164–69; Cardarelli 2010: 98). The higher

- 
- b. è            passat-i            cinquand            ann-i  
 be.PRS.3    pass:PTP-M.PL    fifty            year(M)-M.PL  
 'fifty years have passed'

<sup>12</sup> Just as in Italian, pronominal clitics as well agree in person, while only 3rd person clitics show gender(-number) inflection: 'i(a) nnə lu/li su'p:ɔrte 'I can't stand him/them.M' etc. (cf. Harder 1988: 143f.).

numerals (e.g. *do'mi:la* ‘two thousands’, *do mi'ljo:ni* ‘two millions’, etc.) have only one invariable form, which does not signal agreement. Again, the paradigm is selected depending on the syntactic context in which numerals occur. They agree when they are pronominal, as shown by the examples in (12), but not when they are used adnominally (13)—in both examples, (a) illustrates masculine agreement and (b) feminine agreement:

(12) a. *də frə'ki nə = ,so kunu'ʃ:ut-i 'doj:-i / 'tʃend-i /*  
of child(M) PARTTV=be.PRS.1SG know:PTP-M.PL two-M.PL hundred-M.PL  
*'mil:-i / do'mi:la / do mi'ljo:ni*  
thousand-M.PL two thousand two millions  
‘children, I have known two/hundred/thousand/two thousand/two millions of them’

b. *də frə'ki:n-a nə = ,so kunu'ʃ:ut-a 'doj:-a / 'tʃend-a /*  
of girl(F)-PL PARTTV=be.PRS.1SG know:PTP-F.PL two-F.PL hundred-F.PL  
*'mil:-a / do'mi:la / do mi'ljo:ni*  
thousand-F.PL two thousand two millions  
‘girls, I have known two/hundred/thousand/two thousand/two millions of them’

(13) a. *,so sən'di:tu ,do 'two:n-i/\*-a*  
be.PRS.1SG hear:PTP.M.SG two thunder(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
‘I have heard two thunders’

b. *,so spə'di:tu ,do kartu'li:n-a*  
be.PRS.1SG send:PTP.M.SG two card(F)-PL  
‘I have sent two cards’

Other quantifiers may show agreement (cf. Harder 1988: 153–9). Examples (14)–(15) illustrate the syntactic behaviour of ‘much/many’ (14) and of the universal quantifier ‘all’ (15):

- (14) a. tʃi = 'ʃtje(:va)      'tand-u      'fwo:k-a/\*-u  
 LOC=stay:IMPF.3SG    much-M.SG    fire(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
 'there was much fire'
- b. ,so                    sən'di:tu      'tand-i      'two:n-a/\*-i  
 be.PRS.1SG    hear:PTP.M.SG    many-M.PL    thunder(M)-nonF.SG/-M.PL  
 'I have heard many claps of thunder'
- (15) a. 'tut:-a/-ə/°-u                    'ʃt-u                    'tjemb-a/\*-u  
 all-nonF.SG/-M.SG    DEM-M.SG                    time(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
 'all this time'
- b. 'tut:-i/°-ə/°-a                    'ʃt-i                    'tjemb-a/\*-i  
 all-M.PL/-nonF.SG    DEM-M.PL                    time(M)-nonF.SG/-M.PL  
 'all these times'

In terms of morphology, both 'much/many' and 'all' take the same inflectional suffixes as 'ugly' in (5)–(6), but in terms of syntax, they have a different behaviour: 'much/many' shows full obligatory realization of gender/number marking, whereas 'all' variably shows either full or reduced marking, though the two options do not vary freely: reduced agreement is preferred with singular controllers, full agreement with plural controllers.

Finite verb forms agree in person, number, and gender (cf. Harder 1988: 191–7); gender agreement is exemplified in (16):



(16) a.	'pa:(γ)-u	b.	'pa:(γ)-e	c.	sə = 'pa:(γ)-ə
	pay.PRS-M.SG		pay.PRS-F.SG		REFL=pay.PRS-[3]N
	'I/thou (male referent)		'I/thou (female referent)		'one pays'
	pay/he pays'		pay/she pays'		

Agreement is realized by the same suffixes *-u*, *-e*, *-ə* (cf. 7.2 and n. 10), which also mark the gender and number agreement on nominal agreement targets. This includes a distinct neuter form that surfaces for instance in the impersonal construction (cf. Harder 1988: 196–7, 239), as illustrated in (16c). However, from the data collected during our fieldwork it came to light that not all speakers of present-day Ripano maintain a different neuter form in all contexts. For example, in the same construction where we expected a neuter form *sə 'ri:ðə* 'one laughs' an almost 70 year-old, very good speaker of Ripano, said: *ŋ 'gela 'ka:se sə 'ri:ðə 'pwo:ka* 'in this house one laughs little'. Moreover, he did not confirm the presence of a distinct neuter form agreeing with a neuter subject, and, when asked to translate into Ripano the sentence 'DEF wheat(N) is growing' he responded *lə 'yra 'kre:f:e* instead of *lə 'yra 'kre:f:ə*, indicated by Parrino (1967: 162) and all scholars after him. Nevertheless, our informant confirmed that the verb takes the reduced-inflection form with the suffix *-[ə]* (i.e. the expected neuter form), when it precedes the noun: e.g., *'kre:f:ə lə 'yra*. This suggests the tentative generalization that the neuter ending is becoming restricted—in this informant's variety—to syntactically impersonal clauses (in the sense of Perlmutter 1983)—to which the Unspecified Human Subject construction such as (16c) do not belong (cf. Rosen 1981

[1988]). Here, this ending can optionally appear also with non-neuter nouns: *su lu 'monda 'ti:rə nu 'vjenda 'fwortu* ‘on the mountain blows a strong wind’.<sup>13</sup>

The same markers also occur—quite unusually for Romance—on non-finite verb forms such as gerunds (17) and rhizotonic infinitives (18) (cf. Parrino 1967: 166; Lüdtkke 1976; Harder 1988: 179–236; Ledgeway 2012: 301–2 on verb inflection in Ripano):<sup>14</sup>

- (17) a. N.SG    sta                    nenqu-enn-a    a    careciji        (Cardarelli 2010: 24)  
                  stay.PRS.3            snow-GER-N.SG at    thick\_snow(M).PL  
                  ‘it’s snowing and it’s thick snow’
- b. M.SG    'vje                    ma'ɲ:-en:-u                    (p. 37)  
                  come.IMP.2SG    eat-GER-M.SG  
                  ‘eat! [lit. come eating]’ (male referent)
- c. F.SG    sta                    passènn-e        Pippine        nghe l-a  
                  stay.PRS.3            pass-GER-F.SG    peppina(F).SG with DEF-F.SG  
                  gamme    zifuline                    (p. 89)  
                  leg(F).SG defective.F.SG  
                  ‘Peppina, with her defective leg, is passing by’
- d. M.PL    l-i                    frə'ki            ʃta                    fa'tʃ-en:-i  
                  DEF-M.PL child(M) stay.PRS.3    do-GER-M.PL  
                  l-ə                    mət:ə'ta            jo                    'pʲat:sa        (p. 49)  
                  DEF-F.PL crazy\_thing(F) down square(F).SG  
                  ‘children are joking on the square’

<sup>13</sup> Actually, verb agreement is more complex and further research is needed, especially as the behaviour of our informants seem to diverge in this respect from what other sources report.

<sup>14</sup> Truncated infinitives, ending in a stressed vowel, never show agreement.

e. F.PL do fémməna mæccó 'nziana chə stié  
 two woman(F).PL a bit old.F.PL REL stay.IMPF.3  
 rrəsc-ənn-a da le chiese (Rossi 1999: 132)  
 exit-GER-F.PL from DEF.F.SG church(F).SG  
 ‘two women, a bit old, who were leaving the church’

- (18) a. M.SG nəm 'bɔt:s-u 'ri:ð-u  
 NEG can.PRS-[1]M.SG laugh.INF-M.SG  
 ‘I can’t laugh’ (male referent)
- b. F.SG nəm 'bɔt:s-e 'ri:ð-e  
 NEG can.PRS-[1]F.SG laugh.INF-F.SG  
 ‘I can’t laugh’ (female referent)
- c. M.PL nəm pə't-e:mi 'ri:ð-i/'ri:ð-a  
 NEG can.PRS-1M.PL laugh.INF-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
 ‘we can’t laugh’ (male referent)
- d. F.PL nəm pə't-e:ma 'ri:ð-a  
 NEG can.PRS-1F.PL laugh.INF-F.PL  
 ‘we can’t laugh’ (female referent)

While gender agreement on finite verb forms occurs—though much more sporadically, on isolated verb forms rather than in the entire verbal paradigm—in a few (Italo-)Romance dialects (see Loporcaro and Vigolo 2002–3), as does person/number subject agreement on infinitives and gerunds (the latter occurring in some dialects of Portuguese: cf. Loporcaro 1986), gender agreement on infinitives and gerunds has no parallels in Romance, to the best of our knowledge.

The next examples illustrate agreement on the degree adverb *tand-* ‘much’:

- (19) a. lə                    ˈpa                    ɪɛ                    ˈt:and-a/-ə/\*-u                    ˈsek:a  
 DEF.N.SG      bread(N)    be.PRS.3    much-N/-M.SG      dry.N  
 ‘the bread is very dry’
- b. lu                    frəˈki                    ɪa                    kaˈɲ:at-u                    ˈtand-u/\*-a  
 DEF.M.SG    child(M)    have.PRS.3    change:PTP.M.SG    much-M.SG/-nonF.SG  
 ‘the child has changed a lot’
- c. la/le                    ˈmoj:e                    ɪɛ                    ˈt:and-a/-e/\*-ə                    ˈb:ɛl:e  
 DEF.F.SG      wife(F).SG    be.PRS.3    much-F.SG/-nonF.SG    beautiful.F.SG  
 ‘the wife is very beautiful’

In (19a) *tand-* takes neuter agreement since the controller noun *ˈpa* ‘bread’ is neuter, in (19b) it takes masculine agreement, since *frəˈki* is masculine (cf. also (7) and (12) above), whereas in (19c) it takes feminine agreement, since *ˈmoj:e* ‘wife’ is feminine. Agreement on the degree adverb *ʈʂəp:-* ‘too (much)’ occurs also when it modifies an adjective ((20a–b)) or a verb ((20c–d)):

- (20) a. lu                    frəˈki                    ɪɛ                    ˈʈʂəp:-u/\*-ə/\*-a                    ˈfwort-u/\*-a  
 DEF.M.SG    child(M)be.PRS.3    too\_much-M.SG/-nonF.SG    great\M-M.SG/-nonF.SG  
 ‘the child is terrific’
- b. la                    frəˈki:ne                    ɪɛ                    ˈʈʂəp:-e/-a/\*-ə                    ˈfɔrt-e/\*-a  
 DEF.F.SG    child(F).SG    be.PRS.3    too\_much -F.SG/-nonF.SG    great\F -F.SG/-nonF.SG  
 ‘the girl is terrific’
- c. dʒuˈa                    ˈmaɲ:-u                    ˈʈʂəp:-a/-u  
 Giovanni(M) eat.PRS-[3].M.SG    too\_much-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
 ‘Giovanni eats too much’

- d. ma'ri:e            'maj:-e            'tʃɔp:-e/-a  
 Maria(F)        eat.PRS-[3].F.SG too\_much-F.SG  
 'Maria eats too much'
- e. tu        'kək:u            ðə            'mam:e            ʃ'kri:v-u  
 thou sweetheart(M).SG of            mother(F).SG write.PRS-[2].M.SG  
 'tʃɔp:-a            'l:a    la            ʃ'kɔ:le        (Cardarelli 2010: 42)  
 too\_much -N.SG        there DEF.F.SG school(F).SG  
 'you sweetheart, you write too much over there at school'

In (20a) and (20c) *tʃɔp:-* agrees with *frə'ki* 'child(M)' and *dʒu'a* 'Giovanni(M)', whereas in (20b) and (20d) it takes feminine agreement,<sup>15</sup> since *frə'ki:ne* 'child(F)' and *ma'ri:e* 'Maria(F)' are feminine. In (20c–e) the adverb preferably takes the default form in the innovative variety, though the more conservative subject agreeing form is still accepted. The example in (20e) with a neuter form comes from folk literature, but the author kindly confirmed that he finds *'tʃɔp:u* (i.e. masculine singular subject agreement) also acceptable. Agreement on degree adverbs is found in Italian (to an extent) and in Catalan (cf. Corbett 2006a: 45 and references there).

Example (21) illustrates full agreement on the locative adverb *'ek:-* 'here' in predicative position with the subject argument denoting the thing being located, i.e. the subject *li 'fju:ra* 'the flowers' (cf. also Harder 1988: 251), (22) illustrates agreement on the adverb 'together' with the masculine (22a) resp. feminine subject (22b) of the clause:

---

<sup>15</sup> A form such as *'tʃɔp:e* in (20b) was the norm in earlier Ripano, but is often replaced by forms in *-a* such as *'tʃɔp:a* in the contemporary dialect (cf. 7.2).

(21) l-i                    'fju:ra                    ʃ'ta                    'ɛk:i (Cardarelli 2010: 33)  
 DEF-M.PL            flower(M)            stay.PRS.3            here-M.PL  
 ‘the flowers are here’

(22) a. 'va                    a l-a                    ʃ'kɔ:le                    n'tsje:m-i  
 go.PRS.3            to DEF-F.SG            school(F).SG            together-M.PL  
 ‘they go to school together’ (male referents)  
 b. 'va                    a l-a                    ʃ'kɔ:le                    n'tsje:m-a  
 go.PRS.3            to DEF-F.SG            school(F).SG            together-F.PL  
 ‘they go to school together’ (female referents)

Full gender/number agreement occurs not only on circumstantial but also on predicative adverbs, as illustrated with ‘bad’ in (23):

(23) a. 'ʃt-e:m-i                    'ma:l-i  
 stay.PRS-1PL-M.PL            bad-M.PL  
 ‘we are bad’ (male referents)  
 b. 'ʃt-e:m-a/-ə                    'ma:l-a  
 stay.PRS-1PL-F.PL            bad-F.PL  
 ‘we are bad’ (female referents)

Note that full agreement is found also on some *wh*-words (also occurring as complementizers; cf. Harder 1988: 161–3), other than *kə* (seen in (1)), which are usually uninflected in Romance. This is exemplified in (24) with '*kom*:- ‘how?’, '*(n)do:v*- ‘where’, '*kwan*:- ‘when’, which in Ripano are not invariable but rather inflect according to the paradigm displayed for adjectives in (5i.a) above:

- (24) a. M.SG     *'kom:-u 'ftje?* ‘how are you(M)?’, *'(n)do:v-u 'va?* ‘where are you(M) going?’, *'kwan:-u 'vje?* ‘when do you come(M)?’  
                   *'gwarde 'kom:-u 'fta l:əkə'ni:tu* ‘see how pale he is’ (Cardarelli 2010: 43)
- b. F.SG     *'kom:-e 'ftje?* ‘how are you(F)?’, *'(n)do:v-e 'va?* ‘where are you(F) going?’,  
                   *'kwan:-e 'vje?* ‘when do you come(F)?’  
                   *'gwarde 'kom:-e 'fta l:əkə'ni:te* ‘see how pale she is’
- c. M.PL     *'kom:-i/-a 'fta?* ‘how are they(M)?’, *kom:-a/-i 'fte:ti?* ‘how are you(M).PL’,  
                   *'(n)do:v-i/-a 'je:ti?* ‘where are you(M) going?’, *'kwan:-a/\*-i ve'ne:ti?* ‘when  
                   do you come(M)?’  
                   *'gwarde 'kom:-i 'fta l:əkə'ni:ti* ‘see how pale they(M) are’
- d. F.PL     *'kom:-a 'fte:ma ?* ‘how are we(F)?’, *'(n)do:v-a 'kambe 'kwes:a?* ‘where do  
                   these(F) live?’, *'kwan:-a ve'ne:te?* ‘when do you come(F)?’  
                   *'gwarde 'kom:-a 'fta l:əkə'ni:ta* ‘see how pale they(F) are’

The agreement suffixes are the same as in all other agreement targets: *-u.M.SG*, *-e.F.SG*, *-i.M.PL*, *-a.F.PL/N.SG*. Masculine plural forms show a striking asymmetry, illustrated by Harder (1988: 161–3) and confirmed by our informants—with some differences with regards to *'kom:-*: while interrogative *'(n)do:v-* ‘where’ has the expected masculine plural suffix, for ‘how’ both the agreeing form *'kom:-i* and the default form *'kom:-a* are used; with *'kwan:-* ‘when’ only the default form *'kwan:-a* is used. The perusal of the literature written by native

speakers shows that the default form occurs also in the masculine and feminine singular cells.<sup>16</sup>

Still another syntactic context is exemplified in (25), where the negative pronoun *'j:ɛnda/-ə* occurs in direct object position:

- (25) a. 'fratə = ma          nən    'tsa                  pər'ta          'j:ɛnd-a/-u  
brother(M)=my      NEG    can.PRS.3          carry.INF      nothing-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
'ne                      'm:ak:əne                  'ne                  m:utu'ri  
NEG                      car(F).SG                  NEG                  motor\_scooter(M)  
‘my brother can’t drive anything, neither car nor motor scooter’
- b. 'mam:ə                  nən    'tsa                  pər'ta          'j:ɛnd-a/-e  
mother(F)              NEG    can.PRS.3          carry.INF      nothing-nonF.SG/-F.SG  
‘my mum can’t drive anything’
- c. lə                  sə'rel:a          'two    nən    'tsa                  pər'ta          'j:ɛnd-a  
DEF.F.PL    sister(F).PL    your    NEG    can.PRS.3      carry.INF      nothing-nonF.SG  
‘your sisters can’t drive anything’
- d. li                  fra'tjel:a                      'mje    nən    'tsa                  pər'ta  
DEF.M.PL    brother(M).nonF.SG      my    NEG    can.PRS.3      carry.INF  
'j:ɛnd-a/-i  
nothing-nonF.SG/-M.PL  
‘my brothers can’t drive anything’

In conservative Ripano, *'j:ɛnda/-ə* agrees in gender and number with the subject, which determines selection of the *-u*, *-i*, and *-e* endings in (25a–b, d), whereas F.PL agreement in (25c) is non-distinguishable from the default, non-agreeing, form. In the innovative variety,

---

<sup>16</sup> See Rossi (2008: 170) *quanna sci rrivatu?* ‘when have you arrived(M.SG)?’; Rossi (1999) *quanna tu li vide, già scumbari* ‘when you see them, they have already disappeared (M.PL)’.



on the other hand, *'n:enda/-ə* surfaces in its citation form, which has become (again) invariable, as it was in Proto-Romance and still is in Standard Italian (cf. Mancini 1993: 129).

Even nouns can be agreement targets, agreeing in number and gender with their controller (cf. Parrino 1967: 161–3, 166; Harder 1988: 243–8), a typologically very rare phenomenon, known to occur only in very distant languages from both an areal and a genealogical point of view (cf. Corbett 2006a: 47–9). This is exemplified in (26) by the agreement on the neuter noun *'fred:a* ‘cold’ with the masculine (26a) resp. feminine (26b) subject of the clause:

- (26) a.    *i*            *'sɛnd-u*            *'fred:-u*  
           1SG.NOM    feel.PRS-[1]M.SG    cold(N)-M.SG  
           ‘I’m cold’ (male referent)
- b.    *i*            *'sɛnd-e*            *'fred:-e*  
           1SG.NOM    feel.PRS-[1]F.SG    cold(N)-F.SG  
           ‘I’m cold’ (female referent)

It is not possible to analyse *'fred:-* in (26) as an adjective rather than a noun.<sup>17</sup> This alternative analysis is not viable, since *'fred:-* here, like all its Romance counterparts, has the syntax of a noun (in object position). In fact, in all Romance varieties (including Italian and Ripano) it can be replaced by a direct object clitic: e.g., StIt. *sento freddo* ‘I feel cold’ → *lo sento* ‘I feel it’. In Italian, in addition, it does not agree in gender and number (*Maria sente freddo/\*-a* ‘Maria feels cold’), which proves – in Italian – that this construction involves a noun, not an adjective: of course, the latter argument is inconclusive for Ripano, since gender/number agreement, as we show, targets many more parts of speech than elsewhere in

---

<sup>17</sup> We thank one anonymous referee for helpful discussion of this issue.

Romance. But the argument from cliticization stands, as illustrated by the following sentences (where  $A \neq B \neq C$  stand for different speakers), and suggests that the construction (*sen-to freddo* = V + N) is the same as in StIt.:

- (27) A: 'sɛnd-u                      'fred:-u  
           feel.PRS-[1]M.SG        cold(N)-M.SG
- B: l-ə/\*-u/\*-e                      'sɛndə/-e                      'pu:re    'i(a)  
           DO-N.SG/-M.SG/F.SG    feel.PRS[1]N.SG            even    1SG.NOM
- C: nə                                      'sɛndə/-e                      'tand-a/-ə    'pu:re    'i(a)  
           PARTTV                      feel.PRS[1]N.SG            much-N.SG    even    1SG.NOM
- ‘A: ‘I feel cold’ (male referent). – B: ‘I feel cold too’. – C: ‘I also feel very cold (lit. I feel a lot of it (i.e. cold) too)’

We see in (27, speaker A) that *fred:-* takes the masculine singular suffix *-u* to agree with the masculine singular subject of the clause, but in (27, speaker B) the clitic pronoun replacing it has a neuter form, as *fred:-* is inherently neuter (as shown by the selection of the neuter forms on agreement targets out of context: *lə/\*-u 'fred:a*; cf. also (31) below), whereas the masculine form is ungrammatical, as the masculine value of *'fred:-u* in (27, speaker A) is only a contextual value which yields to the inherent gender value (the neuter) when it comes to decide how the pronominal clitic has to agree. The neuter form of the adverb *'tand-a/-ə* in (27, speaker C) can be explained in the same fashion.

Agreement exclusively targets bare nouns occurring in direct object position, as reported in the literature (Parrino 1967: 166; Harder 1988: 370f.; Mancini 1993: 129).<sup>18</sup> In fact, (26) does

---

<sup>18</sup> Like standard Italian, Ripano does not allow bare nouns in subject position:

not differ in this respect from support-‘have’ constructions such as the following, where the predicative noun also agrees with the subject:

- (28) a. i            tʃ 'ajj-u            'se:t-u/'fa:m-u  
 1SG.NOM    have.PRS-[1]M.SG    thirst(F)-M.SG/hunger(F)-M.SG  
 ‘I’m thirsty/hungry’ (male referent)
- b. i            tʃ 'ajj-e            'se:t-e/'fa:m-e  
 1SG.NOM    have.PRS-[1]F.SG    thirst(F)-F.SG/hunger(F)-F.SG  
 ‘I’m thirsty/hungry’ (female referent)

Out of context, the nouns in (26)–(29) are *'fredr-ə*, *'se:t-e* and *'fa:m-e*, which trigger neuter vs feminine agreement, respectively. By definition, gender agreement on nouns in (26)–(29) is not an instance of overt gender, since the latter is the formal manifestation of an inherent gender specification of the noun at issue.

If the object noun in such constructions is preceded by an agreeing adjective, gender/number agreement with the clause subject is still signalled, but with reduced inflection (on which see (38) below) for masculine agreement, whenever morphologically possible (i.e.,

- 
- (i) lu/\*Ø        'ka            ,ε            nu            kum'baŋ:a            fe'ðe:lu  
 DEF.M.SG    dog(M).SG    be.PRS.3    INDF.M.SG    companion(M).nonF.SG    faithful.M.SG  
 ‘the dog is a faithful companion’
- (ii) li/\*Ø        le'u            ,ε            p:əriku'lu:si  
 DEF.M.PL    lion(M).PL    be.PRS.3    dangerous.M.PL  
 ‘lions are dangerous’

when the noun belongs to the ICs (38i–ii)).<sup>19</sup> This is illustrated in (29), with masculine (a) and feminine (b) controllers:

- (29) a. M.SG    i            'sɛnd-u            'tand-u            'fred:-a /\*-u  
                   1SG.NOM    feel.PRS-[1]M.SG    much-M.SG    cold(N)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
                   ‘I’m very cold’ (male referent)
- b. F.SG    i            'sɛnd-e            'tand-e            'fred:-e  
                   1SG.NOM    feel.PRS-[1]F.SG    much-F.SG    cold(N)-F.SG  
                   ‘I’m very cold’ (female referent)

While (29) exemplifies the most conservative variety of the dialect observable today, a more innovative variety—parallel to what has been shown for ‘nothing’ in (25a–d)—lacks subject agreement on bare predicative nouns in this context, as shown in (30) by the fact that the NP *'tand-a/-ə 'fred:-a* displays a form of the adjective that is compatible with agreement with the neuter head noun *'fred:-a* and is not sensitive to the gender/number specification of the clause subject:

---

<sup>19</sup> An example of reduced inflection is given for *'tjemba* in (i):

- (i) a.            'dʒani:            tʃ 'ajj-u            'tand-u            'tjemb-a  
                   Gianni(M)    have.PRS-[3]M.SG    much-M.SG    time(M)-nonF.SG  
                   ‘Gianni has a lot of time’
- b.            ma'ri:e            tʃ 'ajj-e            'tand-e            'tjemb-e  
                   Maria(F)    have.PRS-[3]F.SG    much-F.SG    time(M)-F.SG  
                   ‘Maria has a lot of time’

- (30) i            'send-u/ 'send-e            'tand-a/-ə            'fred:-a  
 1SG.NOM feel.PRS-M.SG/-F.SG    much-N.SG    cold(N)-N.SG  
 ‘I’m very cold’ (male or female referent for the 1st person subject)

On the other hand, when the noun is the head of an object NP containing an article, agreement with the subject of the clause does not occur, even in the conservative dialect, so that *ftes:-* ‘same’ in (31) surfaces in its non-agreeing (neuter) default form:<sup>20</sup>

- (31) a. 'dʒani    'sendu            lə/\*-u            ʃ'tɛs:-ə/-a            'fred:-a  
 Gianni(M) feel.PRS[3]M.SG    DEF.N.SG/-M.SG    same-nonF.SG    cold(N)-nonF.SG  
 ðə            l:                    'a:tʃ            'an:-a  
 of            DEF                    other            year(M)-nonF.SG  
 ‘Gianni feels the same cold as last year’
- b. ma'ri:ɛ    'sende            lə/\*-u            ʃ'tɛs:-ə/-a            'fred:-a  
 Maria(F) feel.PRS[3]F.SG    DEF.N.SG/-M.SG    same-nonF.SG    cold(N)-nonF.SG  
 ðə            l:                    'a:tʃ            'an:-a  
 of            DEF                    other            year(M)-nonF.SG  
 ‘Maria feels the same cold as last year’

The data in (29)f. (cf. also (25d)) point to on-going change. Indeed, there is evidence that this—for Romance standards—amazing system is on its way to losing some of its most striking peculiarities. Thus, the descriptive literature on Ripano (cf. Harder 1988: 250f.) reports gender/number agreement on nouns within prepositional adjuncts, as shown in (32):

---

<sup>20</sup> It follows from what we have been saying, that a full paradigm, and hence one form used as a default, must be assumed also for parts of speech which usually are uninflected in Romance (and many other languages).

- (32) a. 'ʃi                      rə'maʃt-u                      a                      'rro:m-u  
           be.PRS.2SG                      stay:PTP-M.SG                      in                      Rome(F)-M.SG  
           'thou.M stayed in Rome'
- b. 's-et-i                      rə'maʃt-i                      a                      'rro:m-i  
           be.PRS-2PL-M.PL                      stay:PTP-M.PL                      in                      Rome(F)-M.PL  
           'you.M.PL stayed in Rome'

However, this agreement is deemed ungrammatical by our consultants (who accept only invariable *a rrom-a* in this context), and was already felt as ‘antiquato, contadinesco’ [‘obsolete, rustic’] by Harder’s (1988: 250) informants.

#### 7.4 Prerequisites for overt gender marking

After this overview on the Ripano gender system and gender agreement (which highlighted its typological peculiarities and also took into account on-going or recent change), we now come back to focusing on overt gender marking. There are several prerequisites for overt gender: phonological (7.4.1), morphological (7.4.2), and morphosyntactic (7.4.3).

##### 7.4.1 Phonological prerequisites

Phonological shape can be a prerequisite for the realization of gender on the controller—as well as on the target, as we saw with adjective paradigms in (5)–(6). If either the noun ends in a stressed vowel except -*o*, whatever gender value it has (33a), or ends in -*o* and is feminine (33b), then gender is never marked overtly:

- (33) a. N: *'fje* ‘hay’, *'pa* ‘bread’, *'vi* ‘wine’  
 M: *kruj'ti* ‘toast’, *kula'tu* ‘colander, strainer’, *kuntə'di* ‘farmer’, *'di* ‘day’, *fən'di*  
 ‘young boy’, *fə'ra* ‘blacksmith’, *frə'ki* ‘child’  
 F: *b:ə'fe* ‘lie’, *kumbə'ne* ‘confraternity’
- b. *disku's:jo* ‘quarrel(F)’, *kulə't:sjo* ‘breakfast(F)’, *p:ən'tsjo* ‘rent(F)’, *sta'd:ʒo*  
 ‘season(F)’

Moreover, we will see (7.6) that phonological shape affects the realization of gender, as vowel-initial masculine nouns have overt gender marking in syntactic contexts where consonant-initial ones have covert gender (cf. Harder 1988: 124).

#### 7.4.2 Morphological prerequisites

As Corbett (1991: 62) points out: ‘[a] language with an ideal overt system would have a marker for gender on every noun, with only one marker per gender (for example, all masculine nouns end in *-o*, all feminine in *-a*).’

In Ripano the situation is far from what we expect for such an ideal system (cf. Corbett 2009, 2012: 197–9 on canonical inflection and Corbett 2012: 153–99 on canonical features and values), which combines canonical inflection (same stem, same affixes; cf. Corbett 2007a: 9) with canonical expression of feature values (the features are fully orthogonal to each other and each feature value is realized by one, unique exponent).<sup>21</sup> In a system with four gender and two number values like Ripano, one should expect four inflectional classes, each with two cells. Yet, we have already seen that the neuter lacks a plural and the non-autonomous neuter has no unique form, so that, as a result, we get three inflectional classes with five distinct forms. In a canonical system we would expect full

---

<sup>21</sup> Thanks to Grev Corbett for discussing this point with us.

biuniqueness, so that e.g. all neuter nouns end in *-u*, all masculines in *-o*, and all feminines in *-a*, and moreover that all singular nouns end in *-e* and all plural nouns in *-i*:

(34) Canonical overt gender (hypothetical)

	SG	PL
N	X- <i>u-e</i>	
M	Y- <i>o-e</i>	Y- <i>o-i</i>
F	Z- <i>a-e</i>	Z- <i>a-i</i>

Yet, Ripano has no canonical inflection nor canonical expression of feature values. As for exponence, we cannot point to the expression of masculine or singular in isolation, since they are realized cumulatively, cumulateness being a further deviation from canonicity. If there were a dedicated exponent for each gender-number combination, one would get five distinct gender-number markers:

(35) Canonical overt gender (hypothetical) with cumulative gender/number exponence

	SG	PL
N	A- <i>u</i>	
M	A- <i>o</i>	A- <i>i</i>
F	A- <i>a</i>	A- <i>e</i>

In the hypothetical system in (35) all neuter nouns end in *-u*, all masculines in *-o* in the singular and in *-i* in the plural, all feminines in *-a* in the singular and in *-e* in the plural. Moreover, in the canonical world all nouns would have overt gender marking. Yet, this is not the case in most gendered languages, and it is not in Ripano, where overt gender is the result of a complex interplay of prerequisites and conditions. In addition to the phonological prerequisites (7.4.1), some grammatical prerequisites also have to be met in order for overt gender to show up.



Ripano possesses six main ICs, some of which show different realizations that depend on syntactic context. Table (36) illustrates the strong paradigm of the noun inflectional (sub)classes, i.e. the set that occurs in contexts requiring overt gender marking (the IC suffixes are shown on the left-hand side, where two different capitals signal stem allomorphy and two identical capitals stem identity; gender values correlating with each class are given in the last column):

(36) Noun ICs of Ripano. Strong paradigm (full inflection)

IC	ISC	SG	PL	example	example	gloss	gender
I		A- <i>e</i>	A- <i>a</i>	'ka:se	'ka:sa	'house/-s'	F
II		A- <i>u</i>	A- <i>i</i>	'fij:u	'fij:i	'son/-s'	M
III	a.	A- <i>a</i>	A- <i>i</i>	'pa:tʃsa	'pa:tʃsi	'father/-s'	M
	b.	A- <i>a</i>	B- <i>i</i>	'me:sa	'mi:fi	'month/-s'	M
	c.	A- <i>a</i>		'me:la	----	'honey'	N
IV	a.	A- <i>u</i>	A- <i>a</i>	'mu:ru	'mu:ra	'wall/-s'	NAN
	b.	A- <i>u</i>	B- <i>a</i>	'wo:vu	'o:va	'egg/-s'	NAN
V		A	B	bə'to	bə'tu	'button/-s'	M
VI		uninflected: -V̇ ≠ -ó.SG		'ka	'ka	'dog/-s'	M, F, N ([ 'pa] 'bread')

As already seen in (1), Ripano shows instances of overt gender, but gender(/number) markers are never as in the canonical patterns in (34)—(35): ICs are not clearly distinguished from one another by unique sets of forms. The presence of subclasses distinguished by stem alternations means that inflection is realized by more than one exponent. For instance, in the third class the ISC (36iii.b) displays alternation, while (36iii.a) does not. In class (36v) the number contrast is not realized affixally via inflection but rather through root allomorphy, which must be lexically specified: this is a further step away from a canonical gender system.

Furthermore, the full paradigm displays a syncretism in *-a* between feminine plural of the first class, masculine and neuter singular of the third class and NAN plural nouns of the IC (36iv).<sup>22</sup>

Moreover, nouns of the same gender can belong to different inflectional classes and subclasses, and therefore have different inflectional markings. This is the case for e.g.

*'fij:u/'fij:i* ‘son(M)/-s’ (IC (36ii), which has overt gender in both numbers), *'pa:tʃsa/'pa:tʃsi* ‘father(M)/-s’ (IC (36iii), with overt gender only in the plural), and *bə'to/bə'tu* ‘button(M)/-s’ (IC (36v), no overt gender at all).

To sum up, we find no more than four different exponents for gender-number marking, as shown in (37):

(37) Strong paradigm: Syncretism pattern A

	SG	PL
N	<i>-a</i>	
M	<i>-u</i>	<i>-i</i>
F	<i>-e</i>	<i>-a</i>

As we have seen comparing examples (1)–(2), nouns like ‘time’ have more than one way of realizing their feature specification. While the word form in (1) was drawn from the full paradigm seen in (36), that in (2) came from the reduced one in (38):

<sup>22</sup> While in Standard Italian place names such as *Roma*, *L'Aquila* etc. belong to the same class as *casa* ‘house’, this is not the case in today’s Ripano, where such place names exceptionally take *-a*, not found elsewhere in the singular of feminine nouns, and are thus homophones with their Standard Italian counterparts (as was already hinted to while discussing (32)). Given the overall structure of the inflectional system, this must be a recent innovation, due to standardizing pressure.

(38) Noun ICs of Ripano. Weak paradigm (reduced inflection)

IC	ISC	SG	PL	example		gloss	gender
I		A-e	A-a	'ka:se	'ka:sa	'house/-s'	F
II	a.	A-a	A-a	'fij:a	'fij:a	'son/-s'	M
				'pa:tʃa	'pa:tʃa	'father/-s'	M
				'mura	'mura	'wall/-s'	NAN
	b.	A-a	B-a	'me:sa	'mi:ʃa	'month/-s'	M
				'wo:va	'o:va	'egg/-s'	NAN
	c.	A-a		'mɛ:la	----	'honey'	N
III		A	B	bə'to	bə'tu	'button/-s'	M
IV		uninflected: -V̇ ≠ -ó.SG		'ka	'ka	'dog/-s'	M, F, N ([pa] 'bread')

Some contrasts have disappeared, so that we distinguish four inflectional classes instead of six, as masculine nouns of strong inflectional classes (36ii)—like *'fij:u/'fij:i* 'son(M)/-s'—and (36iii)—like *'pa:tʃa/'pa:tʃi* 'father(M)/-s' –, and non-autonomous neuters of class (36iv)—like *'muru/'mura* 'wall(NAN)/-s'—merge into the same class (38ii), which has just one form for both numbers, with the same ending *-a* found in the mass neuter singular and the feminine plural. The table in (39) shows this pattern of syncretism (leaving aside classes displaying no affixal inflection):

(39) Weak paradigm: Syncretism pattern B

	SG	PL
N		
M		-a
F	-e	

Thus, for nouns exhibiting two sets of inflections, the reduced paradigm is identical to the full one except that it contains the default suffix *-a* instead of *-u* (masculine singular) and of *-i* (masculine plural), so that the gender-number realization is neutralized here (and preserved only in feminine nouns; cf. Paciaroni and Loporcaro 2015 for a more detailed analysis of Ripano noun inflection within the Network Morphology framework).

#### 7.4.3 Morphosyntactic prerequisites

Masculine nouns come in two shapes, whose occurrence depends on syntactic context, whereas for feminine and neuter nouns we find just one set of inflections each, so that their form is not sensitive to syntax. Being masculine is, therefore, a morphosyntactic prerequisite for overt gender marking.

#### 7.5 Syntactic conditions on overt gender marking

Moving on to the syntactic factors determining the use of the different sets of forms, we now focus on masculine nouns and on the identification of the contexts where full or reduced inflection occurs. Again, we start with canonical examples and move on to instances that are increasingly far from canonical.

##### 7.5.1 Overt gender marking

Masculine bare nouns illustrate the case where full distinctions are realized by the morphology, with overt expression of gender:

- (40) 'a                    'fat:a/-ə    'lamb-i/\*-a                    e    't:wɔ:n-i/\*-a  
       have.PRS.3    do:PTP.N    lightning(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG    and    thunder(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
       ‘there was lightning and thunder’

When preceded by the quantifier *'kak:a* ‘some’ (invariant for number and gender), the noun is always plural and has overt gender (and number) marking:

- (41) *'kak:a* *'fiwok-i/\*-a*  
 some fire(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
 ‘some fires’

The noun has overt gender marking after the complementizer *kə*, as already exemplified in (1) with a singular, and now in (42) with a plural noun:

- (42) *kə* *'tjemb-i/\*-a* (*'b:rut:-i*)  
 what time(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG bad-M.PL  
 ‘what (bad) times!’

Overt gender marking is obligatory after a complex quantifier such as *ne/na 'fre:ke də* ‘a lot of’ (43a) or *ne/na frə'ku:je de* ‘a dip of’ (43b), even if this contains a gender-marked noun:

- (43) a. *so* *sən'di:tu* *ne/na* *'fre:ke* *də* *'two:n-i/\*-a*  
 be.PRS.1SG hear:PTP.M.SG INDF.F.SG lot(F).SG of thunder(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
 ‘I have heard many claps of thunder’

- b. tʃe = 'mange                      na/ne<sup>23</sup>      frə'ku:je      ðe      ki'lɔ:metr-i  
 1IO.PL=lack.PRS.F.SG              INDF.F.SG      dip(F).SG      of      kilometer(M)-M.PL  
 'there are still a few kilometres left' (Cardarelli 2010: 37)

We conclude that within the noun phrase overt gender marking occurs: i) if the controller precedes the target, and ii) if the controller is preceded by the potential target, in case the latter has an invariable, non-agreeing, form.

### 7.5.2 Covert gender

We now move on to non-canonical instances, where the controller lacks overt expression of gender and number. As already seen in (2), masculine nouns like *'tjamba* lack overt gender marking in noun phrases with definite articles (a type of target that always precedes the controller). The example (44) illustrates that the same occurs also if the noun is in the plural:

- (44) l-i              'lamb-a/\*-i                      e      l-i              'two:n-a/\*-i  
 DEF-M.PL      lightning(M)-nonF.SG/-M.PL      and      DEF-M.PL      thunder(M)-nonF.SG/-M.PL  
 'the claps of thunder and the flashes of lightning'

The same holds with other determiners in both numbers, that is with indefinite articles

---

<sup>23</sup> While the example originally comes from folk literature (where the quantifier is spelled *na frecuje de*), we have checked the grammaticality of the (more conservative) alternative indefinite feminine singular form *ne* with the author.



The same happens when a vowel-initial noun is preceded by a demonstrative:

- (48) a. ʃt 'an:-a/\*-u                      b. ʃt 'wort-a/\*-u  
 DEM year(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG          DEM garden(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
 'this year'                                      'this garden'

We conclude that selection of the full vs reduced noun paradigm depends on the presence of the determiner. This is reminiscent of Ripano adjective inflection (seen in (5)–(10)), which shows a full vs reduced paradigm distinction depending on syntactic context, as well as of German strong vs weak adjective paradigms, mentioned in that connection. However, it has to be emphasized that in that case the syntactic context affects gender(/number/case) marking on agreement TARGETS, whereas what is at stake here is overt gender marking (cumulatively with number) on agreement CONTROLLERS, which is a much more exotic phenomenon.

An additional agreement condition involves word order. This can be illustrated comparing (42) (repeated as (49)), and (50):

- (49) kə 't:jemb-i/\*-a                      'b:rut:-i  
 what time(M)-M.PL/nonF.SG          bad-M.PL  
 'what bad times!'

- (50) a. kə 'b:rut:-u                      't:jemb-a/\*-u  
 what bad-M.SG                      time(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
 'what a bad time/weather!'



- b. kə            'b:rut:-i            'tjemb-a/\*-i  
       what        bad-M.PL            time(M)-nonF.SG/-M.PL  
       'what bad times!'

The lexical material and the feature specification are identical, yet the realization of gender (and number), found both on the noun and on the adjective, differs: in (49) the noun precedes the adjective and both mark gender, since the strong paradigm is selected; in (50), on the other hand, the adjective precedes the noun and realizes the gender and number marking through the full paradigm, whereas the noun takes the reduced one.

#### 7.6 Shape conditions on overt gender marking

The realization of overt gender is also influenced by phonological properties of agreeing elements. A case in point is noun phrases consisting of a determiner plus a vowel-initial masculine plural noun, as seen in (51) (where (51b) partially repeats (47)):

- (51) a. j:                    'an:-i/\*-a/'wort-i/\*-a  
       DEF.M.PL            year(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG//garden(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
       'the years/gardens'
- b. l:                    'an:-a/\*-u/'wort-a/\*-u  
       DEF                year(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG//garden(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
       'the year/garden'

In (51a) the vowel-initial nouns *'ani* 'years' and *'worti* 'gardens' require the prevocalic allomorph *j:* of the definite article, and we have seen that the corresponding

singular form of these nouns (51b) also requires the prevocalic allomorph.<sup>25</sup> The choice between two variants of a determiner depending on the phonological environment is of course no idiosyncrasy of Ripano, as similar patterns can be adduced e.g. from Standard Italian (52i), French (52ii), and English (52iii):<sup>26</sup>

- (52) i. StIt     *il libro* ‘the book’ vs *lo zio* ‘the uncle’ vs *l’amico* ‘the friend’; *i libri* ‘the books’ vs *gli zii* ‘the uncles’ vs *gli amici* ‘the friends’
- ii. Fr.        a. *le frère* ‘the.M.SG brother(M)’ vs *l’ami* ‘the[M.SG] friend(M)’; *la sœur* ‘the.F.SG sister(F)’ vs *l’amie* ‘the[F.SG] friend(F)’
- b. *mon frère/ami/lit* ‘my.M.SG brother(M)/friend(M)/bed(M)’ vs *ma sœur/chaise* ‘my.F.SG sister(F)/chair(F)’ ~ *mon amie* ‘my.F.SG friend(F)’
- iii. Eng.     *a book* vs *an uncle*

Ripano stands out, however, because only the prevocalic form from one specific morphosyntactic cell of the paradigm (viz. masculine plural *j:* in (51a)) obligatorily selects the strong inflected form of the noun, whereas the masculine singular prevocalic allomorph (51b) co-occurs with the weak form. The same holds for demonstratives, too:

---

<sup>25</sup> Note however that *j:* is formally distinct from preconsonantal *li* and not related to it by any synchronically regular (morpho)phonological rule.

<sup>26</sup> For a discussion of these and similar Romance agreement phenomena see, among others, Plank (1984), Zwicky (1985).

- (53) a. <sub>i</sub>(kwi)ft      'an:i-i/\*-a//wort-i/\*-a  
 DEM            year(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG//garden(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
 'these (near speaker) years/gardens'
- b. <sub>i</sub>(kwi)s:            a'b:i:t-i/\*-a  
 DEM                    chard(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
 'these (near hearer) chards'
- c. <sub>i</sub>(kwi)j:            'woc:i-i/\*-a  
 DEM                    eye(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
 'those eyes'

One could argue that this is an example of a true phonological condition on agreement and thus seems to violate a widespread expectation: 'Syntax is normally taken to be "phonology-free" (Zwicky and Pullum 1983, Pullum and Zwicky 1988). That is, rules of syntax do not have access to the phonological forms of syntactic units.' (Corbett 2006a: 88f).

Yet, we think that this case can be analysed better in another way. In fact, one conditioning factor for the realization of agreement in (51) and (53) is the phonological shape—in particular the initial segments—of both word forms involved. Thus, we treat both the use of the *j:* allomorph and of the strong noun form in *-i* as an instance of a bidirectional 'shape condition', in Zwicky's sense:

- (54) a. Zwicky (1986: 310): 'An SC [= shape condition—T.P. and M.L.] specifies aspects of the phonological shape of *i*-forms [= inflectional forms—T.P. and M.L.], but 'postlexically'—by reference to triggers at least some of which lie outside the syntactic word.'
- b. Pullum and Zwicky (1988: 263): 'there is some support for directly stated

conditions governing the allowable shapes of particular sequences of adjacent words, and we regard these as evidence of conditions stated *on* the interface of syntactic structure and phonological realization, not as evidence of intermingling or interaction *across* the boundary.’ [emphasis in the original]

Shape conditions involve adjacency between the trigger and the affected element, as in our case. Moreover, part of speech specification is not relevant: allomorphs are determined by the initial phonological segments of the following element whatever part of speech it belongs to. Further evidence is given in (55)–(56), where another vowel-initial word intervenes between the definite article (which has the prevocalic form) and the noun:

- (55) a.     1            <sub>1</sub>a:tʂ            'wort-a/\*-u  
           DEF     other            garden(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
           ‘the other garden’
- b.     1            <sub>1</sub>a:tʂ            'an:-a/\*-u  
           DEF     other            year(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
           ‘the other year’
- c.     j:            <sub>1</sub>a:tʂ            'wort-i/\*-a  
           DEF.M.PL    other            garden(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
           ‘the other gardens’

Again, the agreement pattern is the same if the determiner is a demonstrative:

- (56) a. kwɪft            ,a:tʂ            'wort-a/\*-u  
 DEM\M            other            garden(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
 'this other garden'
- b. 'kwɪft            ,a:tʂ            'woc:-i/\*-a//a'b:it-i/\*-a  
 DEM\M            other            eye(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG//chard(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
 'these other eyes/chard'

In (57) the intervening word is the adjective *'b:jej:i* 'beautiful', which begins with a consonant and selects the preconsonantal allomorph *li* of the definite article.<sup>27</sup> The controller is the lexical item 'eye' with the feature specification 'masculine plural', and appears in the fully inflected form.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> In Ripano, adjectives are normally postnominal, and prenominal position introduces a stilted effect for many adjectives, making judgements difficult to evaluate.

<sup>28</sup> After the adjective 'beautiful' in its prevocalic form [masculine] [plural] *'b:jej:* the noun always has the fully inflected form, as illustrated also by example (i), as opposed to (ii):

- (i) kə            'b:jej:            'woc:-i/\*-a  
 what            beautiful\M.PL    eye(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
 'what beautiful eyes!'
- (ii) kə            'b:jel:-i            'tjemb-a/-ə/\*-i  
 what            beautiful\M-M.PL    time (M)-nonF.SG/-M.PL  
 'what beautiful times!'

- (57) li                    'b:jej:                    'woc:-i/\*-a  
 DEF.M.PL            beautiful\M.PL            eye(M)-M.PL/-nonF.SG  
 'the beautiful eyes'

Note that, in the same syntactic context, any other cell of the adjective paradigm would be realized with reduced agreement, as illustrated with masculine singular in (58) (cf. Rossi 1999: 26 for (58a); see also (2a) and (10) above):

- (58) a. l-u                    'bjel:-a                    'gal:-a/\*-u  
 DEF-M.SG            beautiful\M-nonF.SG            rooster(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
 'the beautiful rooster'
- b. n-u                    'bjel:-a/-ə                    'ruʃ:-a/\*-u  
 INDF-M.SG            beautiful\M-nonF.SG            red(M)-nonF.SG/-M.SG  
 'a beautiful red'

## 7.7 Conclusion

To conclude, we have shown that overt gender in Ripano is highly canonical, but conditions are non-canonical. This aptly illustrates the crucial distinction between canonicity and markedness/frequency, since both Ripano overt gender and its conditions are highly marked. As a matter of fact, while gender marking on agreement targets depends on syntactic context in several languages (as exemplified above for German adjective inflection; cf. also the discussion of verb inflection in Somali and Inari Sami in Corbett 2006a: 93–6), this is the first language for which dependency on syntactic context of overt gender (i.e., of gender marking on the controller noun itself) has been described. As Corbett (1991: 62) remarks

the distinction [between overt and covert gender—T.P. and M.L.] is much less rigid than is often implied. There are many possibilities between the poles of absolutely overt and absolutely covert.

Between these two poles, Ripano illustrates a new kind of intermediate option, not documented so far. Moreover, the Ripano system is quite intricate, given the co-existence of prerequisites and conditions at different levels: phonological (shape conditions), morphological (conditions depending on the noun IC), morphosyntactic (gender and number values), and syntactic (word order; presence vs absence of a determiner). As for the morphosyntactic feature values involved in these agreement rules and conditions, a hierarchy emerges: F.SG always has a unique form, i.e. never syncretizes with any other value combination, thus confirming its higher resistance to syncretism observed by Loporcaro (2011: 357) on a pan-Romance scale; and M.PL tends to resist syncretism more than the remaining value combinations. This seems to be a synchronic generalization whose ultimate reason is rooted in sound change, an aspect which we could only touch upon briefly (in 7.2) here.

#### Acknowledgements

Our thanks are due to Greville Corbett and Sebastian Fedden for helpful discussion leading up to this paper, as well as to three anonymous reviewers for observations and criticism on a first draft, while all inaccuracies that should have persisted past their comments are our responsibility. We also gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Swiss National Science Foundation, which partly funded this research as part of the project ‘The Zurich database of agreement in Italo-Romance’ [SNF 100012-156530]. We are very grateful to Fabio Curzi for help in establishing the first contacts with the Ripano speech community and to our Ripano consultants, especially Luigino Cardarelli for help with the organization of

fieldwork and for responding to our many questions. Many thanks also to Remo Bruni, Bruno Ciechi, Armando Capriotti, †Antonio Giannetti, Mariano Giannetti, †Giulio Lambertelli, and Alfredo Rossi. The Ripano data, which stem from our own fieldnotes whenever unreferenced, as well as examples from folk literature checked with native speakers (possibly the authors themselves), are given in a broad IPA notation, whereas examples drawn from publications by native speakers are given in the original spelling. Although the paper was written jointly by the two authors, for academic purposes TP must be held responsible for sections 7.2, 7.4, and 7.6, ML for sections 7.1, 7.5, and 7.7 (responsibility for 7.3 is shared).

### Abbreviations

1 = first person, 2 second person, 3 third person, DEF = definite, DEM = demonstrative, F = feminine, Eng. = English, Fr. = French, GER = gerund, IC = inflectional class, IMP = imperative, IMPF = imperfect, IND = indicative, INF = infinitive, ISC = inflectional subclass, LOC = locative, N = neuter, NAN = non-autonomous neuter, NOM = nominative, nonF = non-feminine, PARTTV = partitive, PL = plural, PRS = presence, PTP = past participle, REFL = reflexive, SG = singular, StIt. = Standard Italian. The symbol % is preposed to clauses which are acceptable—in the given form—for some informants but not for others.

### References

- AIS = Jaberg and Jud (1928–40).
- Baerman, Matthew, Dunstan Brown, and Greville G. Corbett (2005). *The Syntax-Morphology Interface. A Study of Syncretism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burroni, Francesco, Roberta D’Alessandro, Isabella Jordanoska, and Sofja Volkova (2016). ‘Adverbial agreement in Ripano’. Paper presented at the ‘11th Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax-Morphology Meeting’, University of Vienna, 4-6 July 2016.
- Cardarelli, Luigino (2010). *Le parole ritrovate*. [s. l.] [s. n.].



- Corbett, Greville G. (1991). *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, Greville G. (2006a). *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, Greville G. (2007). ‘Canonical typology, suppletion, and possible words’, *Language* 83: 8–42.
- Corbett, Greville G. (2009). ‘Canonical inflectional classes’, in Fabio Montermini, Gilles Boyé, and Jesse Tseng (eds), *Selected Proceedings of the 6th Décembrettes: Morphology in Bordeaux*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 1–11. Available at: [www.lingref.com/cpp/decemb/6/abstract2231.html](http://www.lingref.com/cpp/decemb/6/abstract2231.html).
- Corbett, Greville G. (2011). ‘The penumbra of morphosyntactic feature systems’, *Morphology* 21 (= Jonathan Bobaljik, Uli Sauerland, and Andrew Nevins (eds), *Markedness and Underspecification in the Morphology and Semantics of Agreement*), 445–80.
- Corbett, Greville G. (2012). *Features*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- D’Alessandro, Roberta (2012). *Merging Probes*. Ms., Leiden University (<http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001771>).
- D’Alessandro, Roberta (2017). ‘When you have too many features: Auxiliaries, agreement and clitics in Italian varieties’, *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 2/1, 50: 1–36.
- D’Alessandro, Roberta, and Diego Pescarini (2016). ‘Agreement restrictions and agreement oddities’, in Susann Fischer and Christoph Gabriel (eds), *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance*. Berlin–New York: De Gruyter, 267–94.
- Dryer, M. S. (2007). ‘Noun phrase structure’, in Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. 2. Complex constructions*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 151–205.
- Egidi, Francesco (1965). *Dizionario dei dialetti piceni fra Tronto e Aso*. Montefiore dell’Aso/Fermo: Tipografia La Rapida.
- Ferrari-Bridgers, Franca (2010). ‘The Ripano dialect: towards the end of a mysterious linguistic island in the heart of Italy’, in Robert McColl Millar (ed.), *Marginal Dialects:*

*Scotland, Ireland and Beyond*. Aberdeen: Forum for Research on the Languages of Scotland and Ulster, 107–30.

Gaspari, Gianluigi (1971–72). *Il dialetto di Ascoli Piceno*. Master's thesis, University of Padua.

Harder, Andreas (1988). *Laut- und Formenlehre der Mundart von Ripatransone*. Diss.: Kiel.

Hockett, Charles F. (1958). *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.

Jaberg, Karl, and Jakob Jud (1928–40). *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz*. 8 vols. Zofingen: Ringier [online at <http://www3.pd.istc.cnr.it/navigais/>].

Lambertelli, Giulio (2003). *Elementi di fonetica, ortografia e grammatica della parlata ripana con doppia versione di 'J'sè d lu Rr'ti'*. Acquaviva Picena (AP): Edizioni Lambertelli.

Ledgeway, Adam (2012). *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loporcaro, Michele (1986). 'L'infinito coniugato nell'Italia centro-meridionale: ipotesi genetica e ricostruzione storica', *L'Italia dialettale* 49: 173–240.

Loporcaro, Michele (2011). 'Syncretism and Neutralization in the Marking of Romance Object Agreement', in Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith, Maria Goldbach, and Marc Olivier Hinzelin (eds), *Morphological Autonomy: Perspectives from Romance Inflectional Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 327–57.

Loporcaro, Michele (2016). 'Gender', in Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loporcaro, Michele, and Tania Paciaroni (2011). 'Four-gender systems in Indo-European', *Folia Linguistica* 45/2: 389–434.

Loporcaro, Michele, and Giuseppina Silvestri (2011). 'Vocalismo finale atono e morfosintassi dell'accordo participiale in due varietà generazionali del dialetto di Verbicaro (provincia di Cosenza)', *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 75: 325–56.

- Loporcaro, Michele, and Maria Teresa Vigolo (2002-3). ‘Accordo per genere del verbo finito in italo-romanzo. L’arco alpino orientale’, *L’Italia dialettale* 63–4: 7–32.
- Lüdtke, Helmut (1976). ‘La declinazione dei verbi in un dialetto di transizione marchigiano-abruzzese’, *Abruzzo* 16/3: 79–84.
- Maiden, Martin (2015). ‘The Romanian Alternating Gender in Diachrony and Synchrony’. Ms. University of Oxford. To appear in *Folia linguistica historica* 51 (2017).
- Mancini, Anna Maria (1993). ‘Le caratteristiche morfosintattiche del dialetto di Ripatransone (AP), alla luce di nuove ricerche’, in Sanzio Balducci (ed.), *I dialetti delle Marche meridionali*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 111–36.
- Mengel, Erich (1936). *Umlaut und Diphthongierung in den Dialekten des Picenums*. PhD Thesis. University of Cologne.
- Paciaroni, Tania, and Michele Loporcaro (2015). ‘Multi-layered default in Ripano’. Paper presented within the workshop ‘Inheritance Hierarchies in Morphology’, University of Zurich, 10-11 November 2015.
- Paciaroni, Tania, Graziella Nolè, and Michele Loporcaro (2013). ‘Persistenza del neutro nell’italo-romanzo centro-meridionale’, *Vox Romanica* 72: 88–137.
- Parrino, Flavio (1967). ‘Su alcune particolarità della coniugazione nel dialetto di Ripatransone’, *L’Italia dialettale* 30: 156–66.
- Perlmutter, David M. (1983). ‘Personal versus impersonal constructions’, *NLLT* 1: 141–200.
- Plank, Frans (1984). ‘Romance disagreement: phonology interfering with syntax’, *Journal of Linguistics* 20: 329–49.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K., and Arnold Zwicky (1988). ‘The syntax-phonology interface’, in Frederick J. Newmeyer (ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey: I: Linguistic Theory: Foundations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 255–80.

- Rosen, Carol (1981 [1988]). *The Relational Structure of Reflexive Clauses*. New York: Garland [PhD diss., Harvard University 1981].
- Rossi, Alfredo (1999). *'Ne 'mbize dë perola*. Ripatransone: Maroni.
- Rossi, Alfredo (2008). *Dizionario del dialetto Ripano*. Ripatransone: [s. n.] (Centobuchi di Monteprandone: Linea grafica).
- Thornton, Anna M. (2011). 'Overabundance (multiple forms realizing the same cell): a non-canonical phenomenon in Italian verb morphology', in Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith/Maria Goldbach, and Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds), *Morphological Autonomy: Perspectives from Romance Inflectional Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 358–81.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. (1964). 'K voprosu o grammatičeskix kategorijax roda i oduševlennosti v sovremennom ruskom jazyke', *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4: 25–40.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. (1985). 'Rules of allomorphy and phonology-syntax interactions', *Journal of Linguistics* 21: 431–36.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. (1986). 'The general case: Basic form versus default form', in Vassiliki Nikiforidou, Mary VanClay, Mary Niepokuj, and Deborah Feder (eds), *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: February 15–17, 1986*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistic Society, University of California, 305–14.
- Zwicky, Arnold M., and Geoffrey K. Pullum (1983). 'Phonology in Syntax: the Somali optional agreement rule', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 385–402.